

A note on spherically symmetric naked singularities in general dimension

Peter Langfelder and Robert B. Mann

Dept. Of Physics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1 Canada
 plangfel@uwaterloo.ca, mann@avatar.uwaterloo.ca

February 7, 2008

Abstract

We discuss generalizations of the recent theorem by Dafermos (hep-th/0403033) forbidding a certain class of naked singularities in the spherical collapse of a scalar field. Employing techniques similar to the ones Dafermos used, we consider extending the theorem (1) to higher dimensions, (2) by including more general matter represented by a stress-energy tensor satisfying certain assumptions, and (3) by replacing the spherical geometry by a toroidal or higher genus (locally hyperbolic) one. We show that the extension to higher dimensions and a more general topology is straightforward; on the other hand, replacing the scalar field by a more general matter content forces us to shrink the class of naked singularities we are able to exclude. We then show that the most common matter theories (scalar field interacting with a non-abelian gauge field and a perfect fluid satisfying certain conditions) obey the assumptions of our weaker theorem, and we end by commenting on the applicability of our results to the five-dimensional AdS scenarii considered recently in the literature.

1 Introduction

The issue of cosmic censorship has received renewed attention lately, sparked by claims in the literature [2, 3] that there are physically well-motivated theories in which *open* sets of initial conditions lead to the formation of a naked singularity. Several groups [6, 7, 8, 9] have attempted to find explicit examples of such configurations, but were not successful; further, Dafermos [1] has shown that in $n = 4$ dimensions, naked singularities of the type predicted by [2] in fact cannot arise.

In this paper we employ techniques similar to those used by Dafermos to study whether a similar statement could be made for gravity coupled to a more general matter content in an arbitrary dimension. We further generalize by including singularities of toroidal and hyperbolic topology. Our matter content will be represented by a stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ satisfying certain conditions inspired by the scalar system considered by Dafermos. We will see that while a higher-dimensional generalization including more general topologies of the singularity is straightforward, a theorem similar to the one Dafermos formulated cannot be proven without a detailed knowledge of the dynamics of the matter content. Nevertheless, one can make some progress and exclude certain types of singularities even with a general $T_{\mu\nu}$.

Before proceeding with the details of this generalization, it should be pointed out that our results do not directly apply to the 5-dimensional supergravity scenarios of [3] and [5], since their

work uses a scalar potential unbounded from below that violates the assumptions we will make. It would be interesting to see under what circumstances (if any) the theorem proved here could be generalized for such unbounded potentials. We comment on this issue briefly in Sec. 6.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we describe the system we will study, discuss the assumptions on which our results depend and introduce some useful notation. In Section 3 we review the formulation of Dafermos’ theorem and attempt to generalize its proof to our more general system. While we are able to make some progress, at a certain point we are forced to either make additional restrictions on the kind of singularities that we can exclude or we must restrict the matter content such that we can make progress along the lines of the original proof by Dafermos. We discuss the former, along with some examples of matter content that satisfies our assumptions, in Section 4.1, while the latter is analyzed in Section 5. We close in Sec. 6 with comments on possible extensions and applications to the case of unbounded scalar potential.

2 Setup and assumptions

We work in n dimensions ($n \geq 4$) and consider a system of Einstein–Hilbert gravity coupled to matter with stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. The action is

$$S = \int d^n x \sqrt{g} \left[\frac{1}{2} R + \mathcal{L}_{matter} \right]. \quad (2.1)$$

For now we leave the matter Lagrangian general. Our notation is standard with R denoting the scalar curvature of the metric g . The gravitational equations of motion are

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 2T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.2)$$

with $T_{\mu\nu}$ denoting the matter stress tensor.

Dafermos [1] gave a thorough discussion of the structure of the manifold described by the metric g . Our assumptions are the same except for allowing the “transverse part” of the manifold to be somewhat more general. We will work with light-cone coordinates u, v plus a transverse $(n-2)$ -dimensional space. The metric of the latter will be denoted by $\gamma^{(n-2)}$, and we will take it to be Einsteinian ($R_{ij}^{(n-2)} = k(n-3)\gamma_{ij}^{(n-2)}$) with the constant k taking one of the values¹ 1, 0, or -1 . The full space-time metric will thus have the form

$$ds^2 = -\Omega^2 du dv + r^2 \gamma^{(n-2)} \quad (2.3)$$

where Ω and r are functions of u, v only.

The basic assumptions employed by Dafermos (and us) are (1) that the manifold be evolutionary (roughly speaking, this means that its time evolution is fully determined by suitable initial conditions) and (2) that there is enough symmetry in the transverse coordinates to effectively reduce the evolution to a 2-dimensional problem represented by a region $\mathcal{Q}$ parametrized by the coordinates u, v .

2.1 Matter Stress–Energy Tensor

The matter stress tensor will be assumed to satisfy the following inequalities, written in the coordinate frame of (2.3):

$$T_{uu} \geq 0$$

¹One could take k to be any other real constant as well; the relevant distinction is in the sign of k .

$$\begin{aligned} T_{vv} &\geq 0 \\ T_{uv} &\geq -|2g_{uv}|C, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where C is a constant that we will take to be positive. We will further assume that all components $T_{\mu\nu}$ are continuous. These conditions are a direct generalization of the ones Dafermos [1] imposed on the scalar potential in a system of gravity coupled to a scalar field. Additionally we assume that the matter stress tensor respects the symmetry of the transverse coordinates, meaning that the internal coordinates of the stress tensor must be proportional to the internal metric, with the proportionality factor independent of the internal coordinates (though it can be a function of u, v). This is a natural assumption in the light of the fact that we are assuming a metric that is (maximally) symmetric in the internal coordinates; indeed, it is hard to imagine a maximally symmetric metric being sourced by a matter stress tensor that would not have this symmetry.

As an aside, we note that the conditions (2.4) imply a modified form of the weak energy condition: we have

$$T_{\mu\nu}\xi^\mu\xi^\nu \geq 2C\xi^2 \tag{2.5}$$

for any non-spacelike ξ (*i.e.*, $\xi^2 \leq 0$) whose components lie only in the u, v directions². However it is not possible to derive the conditions (2.4) from (2.5). Likewise, the conditions (2.4) are not strong enough to derive an analogue of the dominant and/or strong energy conditions.

2.2 Geometry of $\mathcal{Q}$ and the Extension Criterion

We again refer the reader to Ref. [1] for an in-depth discussion of the geometry of $\mathcal{Q}$ and the extension criterion characterizing the boundary of $\mathcal{Q}$; for our purposes it will be enough to summarize the main points. The metric on $\mathcal{Q}$ is $-\Omega^2 du dv$, with u, v being global coordinates. The region $\mathcal{Q}$ is assumed to have a boundary consisting of a spacelike curve S and a timelike curve Γ , whose intersection is a single point. The curve Γ consists of all points with $r = 0$, and is called the *centre*. One also defines the *infinity* $\mathcal{I}$ and ingoing ($u = \text{const}$) and outgoing ($v = \text{const}$) null curves.

Denoting

$$\nu \equiv r_{,u} \tag{2.6}$$

$$\lambda \equiv r_{,v} \tag{2.7}$$

we assume that we have $\nu < 0$ along the spacelike boundary S of $\mathcal{Q}$ and at infinity³ $\mathcal{I}$. From the uu component of the equations of motion,

$$(\Omega^{-2}\nu)_{,u} = -\frac{2}{n-2}rT_{uu} \tag{2.8}$$

and the assumption $T_{uu} > 0$ we then deduce

$$\nu < 0 \quad \text{everywhere in } \mathcal{Q}. \tag{2.9}$$

²We remind the reader that the conventional weak energy condition has the form

$$T_{\mu\nu}\xi^\mu\xi^\nu \geq 0$$

for any non-spacelike vector ξ . Details can be found *e.g.*, in [10].

³The boundary condition at infinity is necessary *e.g.*, in asymptotically AdS spacetimes where the spacelike boundary does not constitute a Cauchy surface.

The regular region $\mathcal{R}$, the trapped region $\mathcal{T}$ and the marginally trapped region $\mathcal{A}$, are defined, respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R} &= \{q \in \mathcal{Q} : \lambda(q) > 0\} , \\ \mathcal{T} &= \{q \in \mathcal{Q} : \lambda(q) < 0\} , \\ \mathcal{A} &= \{q \in \mathcal{Q} : \lambda(q) = 0\} .\end{aligned}\tag{2.10}$$

To give a short summary of the extension criterion as formulated by Dafermos, we must introduce some more terminology. For any set U in the (u, v) plane, we denote by $\overline{U}$ the closure of U in the topology of the plane. The symbols J^+ and J^- refer to the causal future and past (*i.e.*, regions reachable by non-spacelike curves), respectively, while D^+ denotes the domain of dependence and I^+, I^- to the chronological future and past (*i.e.*, regions reachable by timelike curves⁴).

For a point $p \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}}$ we will call the indecomposable past (IP) subset $J^-(p) \cap \mathcal{Q}$ *eventually compactly generated* iff there exists a compact subset $X \subset \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$J^-(p) \subset D^+(X) \cap J^-(X) .\tag{2.11}$$

A point $p \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ will be called a *first singularity* iff $J^-(p) \cap \mathcal{Q}$ is eventually compactly generated and if any eventually compactly generated indecomposable proper subset of $J^-(p) \cap \mathcal{Q}$ is of the form $J^-(q)$ for some $q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

This definition means that if $p = (u_s, v_s) \notin \overline{\Gamma}$ is a first singularity, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, denoting $u_\epsilon \equiv u_s - \epsilon, v_\epsilon \equiv v_s - \epsilon$, the compact set

$$X = \{u_\epsilon\} \times [v_\epsilon, v_s] \cup [u_\epsilon, u_s] \times \{v_\epsilon\}\tag{2.12}$$

satisfies $X \subset \mathcal{Q} \setminus \Gamma$, and

$$[u_\epsilon, u_s] \times [v_\epsilon, v_s] = D^+(X) = J^-(p) \cap D^+(X)\tag{2.13}$$

while

$$D^+(X) \cap \mathcal{Q} = D^+(X) \setminus \{p\}\tag{2.14}$$

For $Y \subset \mathcal{Q} \setminus \Gamma$ we define a “norm”

$$N(Y) = \sup\{|\Omega|_1, |\Omega^{-1}|_0, |r|_2, |r^{-1}|_1\} ,\tag{2.15}$$

where, for a function f defined on $\mathcal{Q}$, $|f|_k$ denotes the restriction of the C^k norm to Y . For any *compact* $Y \subset \mathcal{Q}$ disjoint with the centre Γ the norm $N(Y)$ is finite.

The extension criterion can then be formulated as the following property, which we will take as an assumption⁵: if $p \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \setminus \overline{\Gamma}$ is a first singularity, then any compact set $X \subset \mathcal{Q} \setminus \Gamma$ satisfying (2.11) satisfies

$$N(D^+(X) \setminus \{p\}) = \infty .\tag{2.16}$$

⁴Precise definitions can be found *e.g.*, in Hawking and Ellis [10].

⁵Dafermos [1] derives the property from standard results of the theory of differential equations.

3 The n -dimensional Bound

Our equations of motion (2.2), can be straightforwardly expressed in terms of Ω, r and ϕ . For convenience, we use the notation of Dafermos [1] adapted to n dimensions:

$$m \equiv \frac{r^{n-3}}{2} \left(k + \frac{4\nu\lambda}{\Omega^2} \right) \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mu \equiv \frac{2}{r^{n-3}} m = k + \frac{4\nu\lambda}{\Omega^2} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\kappa \equiv \frac{\lambda}{k - \mu}. \quad (3.3)$$

With these definitions, the equations of motion (2.2) can be written as

$$\lambda_{,u} = \nu_{,v} = \frac{2\lambda\nu}{k - \mu} \left[(n-3) \frac{m}{r^{n-2}} + \frac{4}{n-2} r \frac{T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \right] \quad (3.4)$$

$$m_{,u} = \frac{k - \mu}{n-2} \left(\frac{r^{n-2} T_{uu}}{\nu} - 2 \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} \right) \quad (3.5)$$

$$m_{,v} = \frac{k - \mu}{n-2} \left(\frac{r^{n-2} T_{vv}}{\lambda} - 2 \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\nu} \right) \quad (3.6)$$

The equations of motion imply

$$\kappa_{,u} = \frac{4}{n-2} \kappa \nu \frac{T_{uu}}{r}. \quad (3.7)$$

Our aim is to analyze these equations of motion along the lines of Ref. [1] to see how far (or under what additional assumptions) one can generalize Theorem 3.1 of [1], which we now repeat here:

Theorem 1 *Let $p \in \overline{\mathcal{Q}} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ be a first singularity. Then either*

$$p \in \overline{\Gamma} \setminus \Gamma \quad (3.8)$$

or

$$J^-(p) \cap \mathcal{Q} \cap D^+(X) \cap \mathcal{T} \neq \emptyset \quad (3.9)$$

for all compact X satisfying (2.11).

Our strategy is to repeat the steps of the proof with the above definitions and equations of motion and see how far we can progress.

Choose ϵ and X as above in the definition of a first singularity. First, we note that Eq. (3.7) and the assumptions $\nu < 0, T_{uu} \geq 0$ imply

$$\kappa_{,u} \leq 0; \quad (3.10)$$

on the other hand, from the definition of κ we have

$$\kappa = -\frac{\Omega^2}{4\nu} > 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Since κ is positive, bounded on X , and cannot increase along the lines of constant v , it follows that is bounded on $D^+(X) \cap J^-(p)$ by a finite constant we will denote by K ,

$$0 \leq \kappa \leq K. \quad (3.12)$$

Next, since X is compact, the functions $r, \lambda, \nu, \lambda_{,v}, \lambda_{,u} = \nu_{,v}, \nu_{,u}, \Omega, \Omega_{,u}, \Omega_{,v}$ and m are bounded on X . Let us denote the bounds as follows,

$$0 < r_0 \leq r \leq R, \quad (3.13)$$

$$0 > \nu_0 \geq \nu \geq -N, \quad (3.14)$$

$$0 \leq \lambda < \Lambda, \quad (3.15)$$

$$|m| \leq M, \quad (3.16)$$

$$|\lambda_{,v}|, |\lambda_{,u}|, |\nu_{,u}|, |\Omega|, |\Omega^{-1}|, |\Omega_{,u}|, |\Omega_{,v}| \leq H. \quad (3.17)$$

(To simplify the notation, we have used a common symbol H to denote the upper bounds on the derivatives.) The lower bounds on r and $-\nu$ are a consequence of $\mathcal{Q}$ being an open set and X being its compact subset. We now obtain bounds on r, ν, λ and m at any point with coordinates u_*, v_* lying within $D^+(X) \cap J^-(p)$, analogous to ones Dafermos used in his proof of the $n = 4$ theorem.

From (3.5) we have (using $k - \mu > 0, \nu < 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} m_{,u} &\leq -\frac{8}{(n-2)} \frac{r^{n-2}}{\Omega^2} T_{uv}(-\nu) \\ &\leq \frac{8}{(n-2)} r^{n-2}(-\nu)C. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Integrating along $v = v_*$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} m(u_*, v_*) &= m(u_\epsilon, v_*) + \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du m_{,u} \\ &\leq M + \frac{8}{(n-2)(n-1)} CR^{n-1} \\ &= M + \tilde{C} \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where we have introduced

$$\tilde{C} \equiv \frac{8}{(n-2)(n-1)} CR^{n-1} \quad (3.20)$$

to simplify notation in the following.

Similarly, from (3.6) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} m_v &\geq \frac{8}{(n-2)} \frac{r^{n-2}}{\Omega^2} T_{uv}\lambda \\ &\geq -\frac{8}{(n-2)} r^{n-2}\lambda C. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Integrating along $u = u_*$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} m(u_*, v_*) &= m(u_*, v_\epsilon) + \int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_*} dv m_{,v} \\ &\geq -M - \tilde{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Thus m is bounded both from above and from below. It then follows that $\int du m_{,u}$ must be bounded as well, namely it cannot be more than the difference between the upper and the lower

bound. Using (3.5) again we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
2(M + \tilde{C}) &\geq \left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du m_{,u} \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du \frac{k - \mu}{n - 2} \left(\frac{r^{n-2} T_{uu}}{\nu} - 2 \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} \right) \right| \\
&= \frac{2}{n - 2} \left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du (k - \mu) \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uu}}{2\nu} - \int_{T_{uv} > 0} du (k - \mu) \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} - \int_{T_{uv} < 0} du (k - \mu) \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

In the last line, the first and second term are negative, while the last term is positive but bounded,

$$0 \leq -\frac{2}{n - 2} \int_{T_{uv} < 0} du (k - \mu) \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} \leq \tilde{C}. \tag{3.24}$$

Thus we can write, dropping the second term in expression (3.23),

$$\left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du \frac{k - \mu}{n - 2} \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uu}}{\nu} \right| \leq 2M + 3\tilde{C}. \tag{3.25}$$

Considering $\left| \int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_*} dv m_{,v} \right|$, one finds analogously

$$\int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_*} dv \frac{k - \mu}{n - 2} \frac{r^{n-2} T_{vv}}{\lambda} \leq 2M + 3\tilde{C}. \tag{3.26}$$

Next we turn to the quantity ν . Dividing (3.4) by ν and integrating along a $u = u_*$ curve we find

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nu(u_*, v_*)| &= |\nu(u_*, v_\epsilon)| \exp \left\{ 2 \int dv \frac{\lambda}{k - \mu} \left[(n - 3) \frac{m}{r^{n-2}} - \frac{4r}{n - 2} \frac{T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \right] \right\} \\
&\leq N \exp \left\{ 2K\epsilon \left[\frac{n - 3}{r_0^{n-2}} (M + \tilde{C}) + \frac{4}{n - 2} CR \right] \right\} \\
&\equiv N_b.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

For λ we use (3.4) in its original form to obtain

$$\lambda(u_*, v_*) \leq \Lambda + \left| 2 \int du \kappa \nu \left[(n - 3) \frac{m}{r^{n-3}} - \frac{4}{n - 2} \frac{r T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \right] \right|. \tag{3.28}$$

Both κ and ν are bounded as is the first term in the square bracket. As for the second term in the square bracket, we first make a few simple manipulations:

$$\frac{8}{n - 2} \left| \int du \kappa \nu \frac{r T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \right| \leq \frac{2}{n - 2} \frac{K}{r_0^{n-3}} \left| \int du (k - \mu) \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} \right|. \tag{3.29}$$

For the last integral we use the inequality (3.23) again, this time together with (3.25). We find

$$\left| \int du (k - \mu) \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\lambda} \right| \leq (n - 2) (3M + 4\tilde{C}). \tag{3.30}$$

Putting it all together, the final bound on λ reads

$$\lambda(u_*, v_*) \leq \Lambda + 2KN \frac{n-3}{D-2} \frac{M + \tilde{C}}{r_0^{n-3}} + 2 \frac{K}{r_0^{n-3}} (3M + 4\tilde{C}) . \quad (3.31)$$

Lastly, from the relation $\Omega^2 = -4\kappa\nu$ and the upper bounds (3.12) and (3.27) respectively for κ and ν we obtain an upper bound for $|\Omega|$.

Thus, we have obtained bounds on the mass m , radius r and its first derivatives ν and λ , and $|\Omega|$ without having to consider the matter sources in detail. These are not sufficient, however, to exclude all singularities of the type Dafermos' work excluded – indeed, we also need to prove bounds on the second derivatives of r (*i.e.*, first derivatives of λ and ν) as well as on $|\Omega^{-1}|$ and the first derivatives of Ω . We now have two options on how to proceed further: we either make additional assumptions on the geometry that will allow us to continue with a general matter content, or we will specialize the matter content and complete a proof of theorem 1 by analyzing matter evolution as well. The former route is followed in the next Section, while the latter is discussed in Section 5.

4 Singularities in the Regular Region

4.1 General analysis

We now make the additional assumption that the first singularity point p of Theorem 1 lies in the regular region $\mathcal{R}$ so that λ is bounded from below on $D^+(X)$:

$$\lambda \geq \lambda_0 > 0 \quad \text{on } D^+(X) . \quad (4.1)$$

From the relation $\kappa = \lambda/(k - \mu)$ and the upper bound on κ we infer that $k - \mu$ must be also bounded from below,

$$k - \mu \geq \mu_0 > 0 . \quad (4.2)$$

From the definition (3.2) of μ and the facts that m is bounded from above and r is bounded from below we deduce that $k - \mu u$ is also bounded from above.

We now show that $|\nu|$ is also bounded from below by a positive number; that will allow us to prove that $|\Omega|$ is bounded from below, implying an upper bound on $|\Omega^{-1}|$.

To show the lower bound on $|\nu|$, we return to the integral in (3.27). Obviously, to prove a lower bound on $|\nu|$, we must show that the expression

$$\int dv \frac{\lambda}{k - \mu} \left[(n-3) \frac{m}{r^{n-2}} - \frac{4r}{n-2} \frac{T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \right] \quad (4.3)$$

is bounded. We have just shown that $\kappa = \lambda/(k - \mu)$ is bounded both from above and from below; likewise, the first term in the square bracket in the above expression is bounded. Therefore it is sufficient to show that the integral

$$\int dv \frac{T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \quad (4.4)$$

is bounded from above. To obtain this bound, we consider the analog of (3.23) written in terms of an integral over v :

$$2(M + \tilde{C}) \geq \left| \int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_*} dv m_{,v} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_*} dv \frac{k-\mu}{n-2} \left(\frac{r^{n-2}T_{vv}}{\lambda} - 2 \frac{r^{n-2}T_{uv}}{\nu} \right) \right| \\
&= \frac{2}{n-2} \left| \int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_*} dv (k-\mu) \frac{r^{n-2}T_{vv}}{2\lambda} - \int_{T_{uv}>0} dv (k-\mu) \frac{r^{n-2}T_{uv}}{\nu} - \int_{T_{uv}<0} dv (k-\mu) \frac{r^{n-2}T_{uv}}{\nu} \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

This time the first two terms in the last line contribute with a positive sign while the last term contributes with a negative sign. The (absolute value of the) last term is bounded (since T_{uv} is bounded from below) analogously to (3.24); therefore the first and second term must be bounded as well. We are interested in the latter; let us denote the bound as I :

$$\begin{aligned}
I &> - \int_{T_{uv}>0} dv (k-\mu) \frac{r^{n-2}T_{uv}}{\nu} \\
&\geq - \int dv (k-\mu) \frac{r^{n-2}T_{uv}}{\nu} \\
&= \int dv 4\lambda r^{n-2} \frac{T_{uv}}{\Omega^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Since r and λ are bounded from below, it follows that the expression (4.4) is bounded, and thus $|\nu|$ is bounded from below.

The upper bound on $|\Omega^{-1}|$ now follows immediately from

$$\Omega^{-2} = -\frac{1}{4\kappa\nu}, \tag{4.7}$$

since both κ and ν are bounded from below.

In summary, the additional assumption $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 > 0$ allowed us to prove that $|\nu|$ is bounded from below and Ω^{-1} is bounded. On the other hand, deriving bounds on derivatives of Ω, λ and ν is still beyond reach. Indeed, the techniques we used only allow us to estimate *integrals* of various quantities that involve the stress tensor; (integrable) divergences of local values of $T_{\mu\nu}$, and therefore in the derivatives of Ω, λ and ν cannot be excluded. Our result may then be summarized as forbidding the formation of *non-integrable* (in the sense just described) naked singularities⁶ *within the regular region*.

4.2 Examples

In this subsection we investigate which matter theories satisfy the assumptions (2.4) on the matter stress-energy tensor. Dafermos [1] considered a scalar field only; in Section 4.3 we show that the assumptions (2.4) are satisfied by the theory of a scalar field coupled to a (non-abelian) gauge field, and in Section 4.4 we look at matter described as a perfect fluid.

4.3 Interacting scalar and gauge fields

In this subsection we show that the conditions (2.4) are satisfied in a general class of matter theories with the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}} = -\frac{1}{2}|D\phi|^2 - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}, \tag{4.8}$$

⁶An example of an integrable singularity is *e.g.*, a conical defect; on the other hand, any singularity where the metric becomes degenerate (such as a Schwarzschild black hole singularity) is non-integrable.

where the gauge group is a unitary Lie group G , the scalar can be complex and transforms in a representation $\mathcal{R}$ of the group G , and the derivative D is both diffeomorphism- and gauge-covariant. The scalar potential $V(\phi)$ is assumed to be continuous; the conditions (2.4) will turn out to be satisfied if $V(\phi)$ is bounded from below.

Before analyzing this extended system we note that scalar fields and 1-form gauge fields are, up to Hodge duality, the most general that can respect $(n-2)$ -spherical symmetry in n dimensions. Higher-form potentials of rank less than $n-3$ have field strengths with too many components to fit into the two dimensions spanned by (u, v) , while having too few components to fill the $n-2$ dimensions in a symmetric way. A $(n-3)$ -form potential with a $(n-2)$ -form field strength can be spherically symmetric in $n-2$ dimensions, but it is Hodge-dual to the Maxwell field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$, while a $(n-2)$ -form potential with a $(n-1)$ -form field strength is Hodge-dual to the scalar ϕ and its derivatives.

The stress tensor derived from the Lagrangian (4.8) is

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} \left[\frac{1}{2}|D\phi|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\text{tr}F^2 - V(\phi) \right] + \frac{1}{2}D_\mu\phi(D_\nu\phi)^\dagger + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}F_{\mu\lambda}F_\nu{}^\lambda. \quad (4.9)$$

Specializing to components we find

$$T_{uu} = \frac{1}{2}(D_u\phi) \cdot (D_u\phi)^\dagger, \quad (4.10)$$

$$T_{vv} = \frac{1}{2}(D_v\phi) \cdot (D_v\phi)^\dagger, \quad (4.11)$$

$$T_{uv} = -\frac{1}{2}g_{uv}V(\phi) - \frac{1}{8}g^{uv}\text{tr}F_{uv}F_{uv}. \quad (4.12)$$

In the T_{uu} and T_{vv} expressions, the dot denotes the group-invariant scalar product within the representation $\mathcal{R}$ in which ϕ transforms under G . Assuming this inner product is positive (this assumption is true for unitary groups), T_{uu} and T_{vv} are manifestly positive. Likewise, given that g_{uv} is negative, it is clear that the first term in T_{uv} will satisfy (2.4) as long as the potential V satisfies $V(\phi) \geq -4C$, while the second term is positive as long as the inner product in the adjoint representation of G is positive. Thus the matter content specified by the Lagrangian (4.8) satisfies the assumptions of our theorem. We note that this statement also remains true if the scalar field develops a vacuum expectation value and triggers a spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking.

4.4 Perfect Fluids

One can also contemplate matter in the case when only a hydrodynamic description is available. Specifically, we can consider a perfect fluid with a stress-energy tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p)U_\mu U_\nu + pg_{\mu\nu}, \quad (4.13)$$

where U_μ (not to be confused with the coordinate u) is the velocity field of the fluid. We will assume that the pressure p and energy density ρ are related *via* an equation-of-state constant w as

$$p = w\rho. \quad (4.14)$$

Further, in accord with our general discussion in Section 2, we will assume that the velocity field U^μ has components only in the (u, v) coordinates. For a massive fluid, we then have

$$T_{uu} = (\rho + p)U_u^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{vv} &= (\rho + p)U_v^2 \\
T_{uv} &= -\frac{1}{2}g_{uv}(\rho - p)
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.15}$$

where we have simplified the expression for T_{uv} using the fact that the velocity U is time-like and normalized to $U^2 = -1$. It is clear that T_{uu} and T_{vv} will be non-negative whenever either $(\rho \geq 0, w \geq -1)$ or $(\rho < 0, w \leq -1)$. On the other hand, T_{uv} will remain non-negative as long as $(\rho \geq 0, w \leq 1)$ or $(\rho \leq 0, w \leq -1)$. Together our theorem excludes formation of naked singularities (non-integrable and in the regular region) for any perfect fluid satisfying $\rho \geq 0, -1 \leq w \leq 1$. It would be interesting to see whether a lower bound on T_{uv} could be proved even for (a range of) $w > 1$ (with $\rho \geq 0$); however we were unable to do so.

For a massless fluid, the condition $0 = U^2 = 2g_{uv}U^uU^v$ implies that at least one of the components U^u, U^v must be zero. T_{uu} and T_{vv} are still given by the expressions 4.15, while T_{uv} takes the form

$$T_{uv} = pg_{uv} = -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^2 p. \tag{4.16}$$

Obviously, T_{uv} will be bounded from below if the pressure p is negative⁷. Taking into account the condition $\rho + p \geq 0$ coming from the T_{uu} and T_{vv} components we find that the assumptions of our theorem are satisfied when $(\rho > 0, -1 \leq w \leq 0)$.

5 Specializing the Matter Content

The result of Section 4.1 is that without a detailed study of the evolution of matter that sources the geometry, only a weaker statement about possible naked singularities can be made. On the other hand, it is in general very hard to analyze a fully interacting matter-gravity system such as the one studied in Section 4.3 to prove that its stress tensor will not develop singularities of the kind that are not excluded our earlier general arguments. Dafermos has nevertheless shown that such an analysis can be performed for a scalar field in $n = 4$ dimensions; the aim of this Section is to show that this analysis generalizes straightforwardly to any dimension $n \geq 4$, any k characterizing the topology of the transverse space and that one can also include a free gauge field.

Thus, we analyze the evolution of a neutral scalar with potential V and a free gauge field potential A_μ with field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ in more detail, following Dafermos [1]. The Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{matter} = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\phi)^2 - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}, \tag{5.1}$$

leading to the stress-energy tensor

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\frac{\delta S_{matter}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\phi)^2 - V(\phi) - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\phi_{,\mu}\phi_{,\nu} + \frac{1}{2}F_{\mu\lambda}F_{\nu}{}^{\lambda}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.2}$$

For the scalar field we again employ notation analogous to that used by Dafermos [1]: we denote

$$\zeta \equiv r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\phi_{,u} \tag{5.3}$$

$$\theta \equiv r^{\frac{n-2}{2}}\phi_{,v}. \tag{5.4}$$

⁷Again, there may be a regime where even a positive pressure leads to a development with a T_{uv} bounded from below, but we were not able to find such a development or conditions guaranteeing it.

The scalar equation of motion can then be written in two equivalent forms as

$$\zeta_{,v} = -\frac{n-2}{2} \frac{\nu\theta}{r} - r^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \frac{\lambda\nu}{k-\mu} V' \quad (5.5)$$

$$\theta_{,u} = -\frac{n-2}{2} \frac{\lambda\zeta}{r} - r^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \frac{\lambda\nu}{k-\mu} V'. \quad (5.6)$$

As for the gauge field, to respect spherical symmetry in any dimension $n > 4$, the field strength can only have one nonzero component, namely F_{uv} , and it can only be a function of u and v . The gauge field equations, $F_{\mu\nu};^\nu = 0$, can be written as

$$(\sqrt{g}F^{\mu\nu})_{;\nu} = 0. \quad (5.7)$$

In components they read

$$(\sqrt{g}F^{uv})_{;u} = (\sqrt{g}F^{uv})_{;v} = 0, \quad (5.8)$$

implying that

$$F^{uv} = \frac{q_e}{\Omega^2 r^{n-2}}. \quad (5.9)$$

The constant q_e is, of course, interpreted as the electric charge.

In $n = 4$ dimensions one can have, in addition to the electric configurations discussed above, also magnetic configurations: since the internal space is 2-dimensional, one can take F to be proportional to the volume form on the internal space, $F_{ij} = q_m \sqrt{\gamma} \epsilon_{ij}$, where q_m is the magnetic charge of the source. The most general spherically symmetric field strength is a combination of the electric and magnetic configurations with arbitrary charges.

Irrespective of the dimensionality it is clear that a spherically symmetric gauge field has no propagating degrees of freedom. However, it will contribute to the equations of motion *via* the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. Both electric and magnetic charges contribute to the stress-energy in the same way, making it useful to define a “total” (dyonic) charge

$$q^2 \equiv q_e^2 + q_m^2. \quad (5.10)$$

This quantity will enter the equations of motion we discuss next.

The matter stress tensor components in the frame (2.3) are

$$\begin{aligned} T_{uu} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\zeta^2}{r^{n-2}} \\ T_{vv} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta^2}{r^{n-2}} \\ T_{uv} &= \frac{1}{4} \Omega^2 \left(V(\phi) + \frac{1}{8} \frac{q^2}{r^{2(n-2)}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

The components T_{uu} and T_{vv} are manifestly non-negative, satisfying (2.4). The condition on T_{uv} will be satisfied if

$$V(\phi) \geq -4C. \quad (5.12)$$

In addition, we must require V and its first derivative to be continuous. Under these assumptions on $V(\phi)$ we can derive bounds ϕ as well its derivatives (represented by θ and ζ). Note that the presence or absence of the gauge field does not change the condition on V in a qualitative way:

since r is bounded from both below and above, the contribution of the gauge field would at most lead to a redefinition of the constant C .

Analogously to the discussion above (3.13), compactness of X together with continuity of ϕ , ζ and θ implies that the latter are bounded on X . We denote the bounds as follows,

$$|\phi| \leq P, \quad (5.13)$$

$$|\theta| \leq \Theta, \quad (5.14)$$

$$|\zeta| \leq T, \quad (5.15)$$

Let us now consider ϕ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(u_\star, v_\star)| &\leq |\phi(u_\star, v_\epsilon)| + \left| \int_{v_\epsilon}^{v_\star} dv \frac{\theta}{r^{(n-2)/2}} \right| \\ &\leq P + \left[\int dv \frac{\theta^2(k-\mu)}{\lambda} \int dv' \frac{\lambda}{r^{n-2}(k-\mu)} \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

The last inequality follows from the well-known relation, for any two square-integrable functions f, g ,

$$\left(\int fg \right)^2 \leq \left(\int f^2 \right) \left(\int g^2 \right). \quad (5.17)$$

The first term in the square bracket above can be bounded using (3.26), while the second can be bounded as

$$\int dv \frac{\lambda}{r^{n-2}(k-\mu)} \leq \epsilon K r_0^{2-n}. \quad (5.18)$$

Together we have

$$|\phi(u_\star, v_\star)| \leq P + \left\{ (n-2)(2M + 3\tilde{C})\epsilon K r_0^{2-n} \right\}^{1/2} \equiv P_b. \quad (5.19)$$

Having found a bound for ϕ , we can denote

$$C_b \equiv \sup_{|\phi| \leq P_b} V(\phi), \quad (5.20)$$

$$C'_b \equiv \sup_{|\phi| \leq P_b} V'(\phi). \quad (5.21)$$

We can use the boundedness of the attained values of the potential to constrain λ more directly than in (3.31). We use (3.4) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda(u_\star, v_\star)| &\leq |\lambda(u_\epsilon, v_\star)| + \left| \int du \kappa \nu \left[(n-3) \frac{m}{r^{n-2}} - \frac{2}{n-2} r V \right] \right| \\ &\leq \Lambda + 2K \left[(n-3)(M + \tilde{C}) \frac{r_0^{3-n}}{n-3} + \frac{1}{n-2} C_b R^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Lastly, we can derive bounds on the derivatives of ϕ : integrating (5.6) along $v = v_\star$ we have

$$|\theta(u_\star, v_\star)| \leq |\theta(u_\epsilon, v_\star)| + \left| \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_\star} du \frac{\lambda \zeta}{r} \right| + \left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_\star} du \frac{\lambda \nu}{k-\mu} r^{(n-2)/2} V' \right|. \quad (5.23)$$

Eq. (5.14) provides a bound for the first term on the r.h.s, while for the second term we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du \frac{\lambda \zeta}{r} \right| &= \left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du \left[\sqrt{k-\mu} \frac{\zeta}{(-\nu)} \sqrt{-\nu} \right] \left[\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{k-\mu}} \frac{\sqrt{-\nu}}{r} \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left[\int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du (k-\mu) \left(\frac{\zeta}{\nu} \right)^2 (-\nu) \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du' \frac{\lambda^2}{k-\mu} \frac{(-\nu)}{r^2} \right]^{1/2} \\
&= \left[\int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du \left(-2(n-2)m_{,u} + 16\nu \frac{r^{n-2} T_{uv}}{\Omega^2} \right) \right]^{1/2} \left[\int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du' \kappa^2 (k-\mu) \frac{(-\nu)}{r^2} \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left[4(n-2)(M + \tilde{C}) + \frac{16}{n-1} CR^{n-1} \right]^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left[K^2 \left\{ |k| + \frac{1}{r_0^{n-3}} (M + \tilde{C}) \right\} \frac{1}{r_0} \right]^{1/2} \tag{5.24}
\end{aligned}$$

(we have used (3.5) and the lower bound on T_{uv} in (2.4)), and for the third term we have

$$\left| \int_{u_\epsilon}^{u_*} du \frac{\lambda \nu}{k-\mu} r^{(n-2)/2} V' \right| \leq \frac{2}{n} K C'_b R^{n/2}. \tag{5.25}$$

Since all three terms on the r.h.s. of (5.23) are bounded, we can write

$$|\theta(u_*, v_*)| \leq \Theta_b. \tag{5.26}$$

For ζ we have, from (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
|\zeta(u_*, v_*)| &\leq |\zeta(u_*, v_\epsilon)| + \left| \int dv \left(\frac{n-2}{2r} \nu \theta + r^{n-2} 2 \frac{\lambda \nu}{k-\mu} V' \right) \right| \\
&\leq Z_b. \tag{5.27}
\end{aligned}$$

The bound can by now be arrived at in different ways, the simplest one being to notice that all quantities entering the r.h.s of the first line in (5.27) are bounded (r entering denominators is bounded from below and $\lambda/(k-\mu) \equiv \kappa < K$, so denominators do not pose any problems either).

We have thus established that ϕ as well as its first derivatives are finite. It follows (from continuity of $V(\phi)$) that all scalar contributions to the stress-energy tensor are bounded; the gauge contribution is bounded by virtue of the lower bound on r .

Having thus established finiteness of the matter stress-energy tensor, it is now clear from (3.27) that $|\nu|$ will be bounded from below as well as from above. Further, integrating Eq. (3.7) as an equation for κ with respect to u similarly shows that κ will be bounded from below as well. Eq. (4.7) then gives an upper bound on both $|\Omega|$ and $|\Omega^{-1}|$.

To establish a bound on $\nu_{,u}$ we differentiate (3.4) with respect to u to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nu_{,u})_{,v} &= 2(\nu_{,u} \kappa + \nu \kappa_{,u}) \left[(n-3) \frac{m}{r^{n-2}} + \frac{1}{n-2} r \left(V(\phi) + \frac{1}{8} \frac{q^2}{r^{2(n-2)}} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + 2\nu \kappa \left[(n-3) \frac{m_{,u}}{r^{n-2}} - (n-2)(n-3) \nu \frac{m}{r^{D-1}} + \frac{1}{n-2} \nu \left(V(\phi) + \frac{1}{8} \frac{q^2}{r^{2(n-2)}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{n-2} r \left(V'(\phi) r^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \zeta + \frac{2(n-2)}{8} \nu \frac{q^2}{r^{2n-3}} \right) \right] \tag{5.28}
\end{aligned}$$

Viewing this equation as a differential equation for $\nu_{,u}$ (taking into account (3.5) and (3.7) with the stress-energy tensor given by (5.11)), it is easy to see that all coefficients are uniformly bounded. Thus, integrating this equation in v with regular initial conditions must give a uniformly bounded $\nu_{,u}$. A bound on $\lambda_{,v}$ is derived analogously.

To derive bounds on the derivatives of Ω , we use the internal (ij) components of 2.2 that lead to

$$-(\ln \Omega^2)_{,uv} = -\frac{(n-3)(4-n)}{r^2} \left[r_{,u} r_{,v} k \frac{\Omega^2}{2} \right] + 2 \frac{\zeta \theta}{r^{n-2}} - V(\phi) + \frac{q^2}{8r^{2(n-2)}}. \quad (5.29)$$

Integrating this equation in u and v will give a bound on $\Omega_{,v}$ and $\Omega_{,u}$, respectively, since all terms on the r.h.s. are bounded (and initial values of $\Omega_{,v}$ and $\Omega_{,u}$ on X are bounded by assumption (3.17).

This completes the analog of the $n = 4$ proof given by Dafermos for all dimensions 4 and greater, and for locally flat and locally hyperbolic transverse part of the spacetime.

6 Comments on certain problems involving potentials unbounded from below

Unfortunately the theorem proved here does not apply to an interesting class of problems, namely the 5-dimensional problems studied in [3, 5] that contain a scalar field with a potential unbounded from below. It would be surprising if our methods extended to that case: while Dafermos' theorem is in its nature local and thus independent of the boundary conditions imposed on the scalar field, the superstring-inspired supergravity theories of [3, 5] depend crucially on the scalar boundary conditions. Indeed, they would be ill-defined if the scalar field were not required to approach asymptotically a fixed value for which the potential has a maximum. It follows that a proof along the lines of the one discussed here would then also apply to unstable gravitational theories – but in such theories one would expect naked singularities to form, thus invalidating the putative proof of the theorem.

In the absence of a proof for theories with unbounded potentials, one can ask whether the Dafermos theorem can be used at least as a qualitative guide; in other words, whether qualitative features of the evolution of theories with potentials unbounded from below actually depend on the fact that the potential is unbounded. One can, for example, imagine cutting the potential off at some large but finite (negative) value and ask whether this change affects the basic properties of the solutions discussed in [3, 5].

The solutions discussed in [3, 5] contain a homogeneous inner region that evolves as (a patch of) an FRW universe. As pointed out in [3], the evolution near the singularity is dominated by the kinetic energy of the scalar field. In particular, cutting off the potential at a large negative value does not qualitatively change the evolution; a space-like singularity still forms in finite proper time. If the potential is cut off from below⁸, the theorem proved above forbids the type of singularity suggested in [3].

Unfortunately, this argument does not prove that a naked singularity cannot form in the setup of [3]: our argument just shows that if a singularity forms, in the inner region it will appear as a big crunch-type singularity. However the argument does not apply to the intermediate region, where the singularity could become time-like or end. Only if one could show that the potential cutoff is inconsequential even in this region, would the singularity of [3] be ruled out and the conclusion of [5] (that such singularities are of the big crunch type, cutting off all space) would be confirmed.

⁸The cutoff must be at least continuously differentiable to satisfy the assumptions of the theorem; one can certainly use a smooth cutoff if necessary.

The situation is better in the case of the gravitational instanton of [5]. As discussed in that work, there is no “intermediate region” – namely, outside of the lightcone of the origin (for details, see [5] Sec. 3.3 and 3.4) the scalar field remains bounded and as such will be unaffected if the potential is cut off only for sufficiently large ϕ . On the other hand, the spacetime inside the lightcone is an open FRW universe that will evolve to a big crunch irrespective of whether the potential is bounded from below. In this case, therefore, our generalization of Dafermos’ theorem confirms that a naked singularity cannot form.

7 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank David Garfinkle and Mihalis Dafermos for insightful discussions and encouragement. This research was supported by in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] M. Dafermos, “A note on naked singularities and the collapse of self-gravitating Higgs fields,” arXiv:gr-qc/0403033.
- [2] T. Hertog, G. T. Horowitz and K. Maeda, “Generic cosmic censorship violation in anti de Sitter space,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 131101 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0307102].
- [3] T. Hertog, G. T. Horowitz and K. Maeda, “Negative energy in string theory and cosmic censorship violation,” Phys. Rev. D **69**, 105001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0310054].
- [4] T. Hertog, G. T. Horowitz and K. Maeda, “Update on cosmic censorship violation in AdS,” arXiv:gr-qc/0405050.
- [5] T. Hertog and G. T. Horowitz, “Towards a big crunch dual,” arXiv:hep-th/0406134.
- [6] M. Gutperle and P. Kraus, “Numerical study of cosmic censorship in string theory,” JHEP **0404**, 024 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0402109].
- [7] V. E. Hubeny, X. Liu, M. Rangamani and S. Shenker, “Comments on cosmic censorship in AdS/CFT,” arXiv:hep-th/0403198.
- [8] D. Garfinkle, “Numerical simulation of a possible counterexample to cosmic censorship,” Phys. Rev. D **69**, 124017 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0403078].
- [9] A. V. Frolov, “Is it really naked? On cosmic censorship in string theory,” arXiv:hep-th/0409117.
- [10] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, “The Large Structure of Space-Time”, Cambridge University Press, 1973